

REMARKS

Reexamination and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended FIG. 1 by the replacement sheet submitted herewith to correct a misspelling of CONTROL IC within the box identified by reference number 2.

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the phrase "*the reception completion determination means monitors the serial data for a special bit added to the serial data and outputs the reception completion signal when the special bit is detected*" is not disclosed in the specification. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Per the telephone discussion between Applicant's undersigned attorney and the Examiner on March 2, 2005, the present specification does in fact disclose the above noted recitation. Specifically, page 9, lines 25-26 of the specification disclose that the start signal ST functions as a reception completion signal. Page 20, lines 1-5 of the specification disclose that the start signal ST is output when special bits, such as a start bit and a stop bit, can be added to serial data, and that the signal ST is output upon detection of the special bits.

In view of the support provided for the above noted recitation, Applicants assert that claim 3 complies, without amendment, with the written description requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

Further, it should be noted that claim 3 has been amended into independent form to include the limitations of claim 1 (now canceled) in a manner that complies with the requirements of 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs. Specifically, as in original claim 1, new independent claim 3 recites "a receiving shift register." The Examiner rejected claim 1

under 35 USC 112, second paragraph because, as he asserted, a receiving shift register plays no part in the apparatus. Applicant has amended claim 3 to recite *inter alia* that the reception completion determination means *is coupled to* the receiving shift register. Therefore, as the limitations of claim 1 as added to claim 3 clearly comply with the definiteness requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph, Applicant asserts that claim 3 complies with the definiteness requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner should note that amended claim 2 and new claim 8 also recite the above discussed structural relationship between the receiving shift register and the reception completion determination means/device in a manner similar to that used in claim 3.

In addition to claim 1, the Examiner also rejected claims 2-7 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The rejection of claim 1 was discussed above. The rejection of each of claims 4, 5, 6 and 7 will be discussed in detail as follows.

Regarding claim 4, the Examiner asserts that it is unclear if the limitation “an oscillation control unit” refers to DATA PROCESS 11, and that there are no structural relationships among elements recited in claim 4 with the device recited in claim 1.

Applicant notes that claims 4 and 5 have been canceled. Claims 8 and 9 have been added and correspond generally to original claims 4 and 5, respectively, albeit in a slightly different format. Claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, an oscillation control unit that is included in the data processor (such as the DATA PROCESS 11 shown in FIG. 2) and that is for “generating an oscillation command signal in response to receiving the reception completion signal from the reception completion determination device.” Support for this recited feature is shown, for example, in FIG. 2 and described on page 11, line 27 – page 12, line 4 (data process 11 includes an oscillation control unit). In addition, claim 8 also recites a control circuit for operating

synchronously with the system clock signal and including an oscillation unit in communication with the oscillation control unit. As each element recited in claim 8 is related structurally or operationally with other recited elements in the claim, claim 8 therefore complies with the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claim 9 recites with proper antecedent basis that “the oscillation control unit outputs the oscillation command signal *based on* command data corresponding to the serial data (emphasis added).” Claim 9 therefore complies with the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, as with claim 4, the Examiner asserts that certain elements recited in these claims lack structural or operational relationships with the device originally recited in claim 1.

Claim 6 has been amended so that each element recited therein is related structurally or operationally with other elements recited therein in a manner similar to that used in claim 8. Claim 7 has been amended so that the recited timer is “included in the control circuit and in communication with the oscillation unit for counting the system clock signal...”.

As each element recited in claims 6 and 7 is related structurally or operationally with other recited elements in the claims, claims 6 and 7 comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 6 and 7 be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Jobling ‘293. However, as noted above, claim 1 has been canceled. Therefore, the merits of the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1 will not be addressed.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 2 and 4-7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph noted above. The

Examiner's indication that these claims contain allowable subject matter is noted and appreciated. In response, claim 2 has been rewritten into independent form to include the limitations of claim 1 (now canceled) as noted above, and claim 8 has been written in independent form to include the limitations of claim 1 (now canceled) as noted above, as well as the limitations originally recited in claim 4 (now canceled). In addition, claim 3 has been amended into independent form to include the limitations of claim 1 (now canceled) as noted above and is also believed to be in allowable form. Therefore, claim 2 (as well as claim 6 that depends therefrom), claim 3 and claim 8 (as well as claims 7 and 9 that depend therefrom) are now in allowable form.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Although no additional fees are believed to be due, permission is hereby given to charge any unforeseen fees to deposit account 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Posz', with a stylized flourish at the end.

David G. Posz
Reg. No. 37,701

Posz Law Group, PLC
12040 South Lakes Drive, Suite 101
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 707-9110 (phone)
Customer No. 23400

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the as-filed drawing sheet that includes FIG. 1 with the replacement drawing sheet submitted herewith. In the replacement drawing sheet, the misspelled term COTROL IC within the box identified by reference number 2 has been amended to CONTROL IC. Written confirmation that the above replacement drawing sheet has been considered, approved and entered into the record is respectfully requested.

Attachment: 1 replacement drawing sheet (FIG. 1)